

**RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER**

MAY 12 2006

Application Serial No.: 10/010,352
 Filing Date: 11/13/2001
 Inventors: Shelest, A.
 Applicant: Microsoft Corporation
 Group Art Unit: 2136
 Examiner: Parthasarathy, P.
 Confirmation No.: 8322
 Applicant's Docket No.: 171135.02
 Title: Methods and Systems for Unilateral Authentication of Messages

EXAMINER INTERVIEW AGENDA, MAY 17, 2006, 200p - 300p EDT

Location: Office of Examiner Pramila Parthasarathy, USPTO

Dear Examiner Parthasarathy:

Pursuant to my telephone message I left on your voicemail system, I anticipate coming by your office on the date indicated above for a personal interview regarding the referenced matter. At the same time, I would like to review matter number 09/833,922. A separate agenda for that matter will be sent together with this agenda.

First, there is a matter of an accurate date of the O'Shea reference listed in an IDS filed with this matter and cited as a reference in the current Office Action dated 02/27/2006. The IDS incorrectly listed the reference date as being in the year 2000. In actuality, the publication date of said reference is April 2001.

It is noted that the author of the disputed reference is an inventor of the present invention and that Applicant was aware of the accurate publication date at the time the present application was filed (in April, less than a year after said publication). It is easy to see from the face of the reference why a clerical error was made since the date of 2000 is listed in a footnote on the first page of the reference.

Applicant, as an officer licensed to practice before the USPTO, avers to the authenticity of the date of publication. If this is not enough proof for the Examiner to accept this date as the date of the reference, Applicant requests that the Examiner make a request indicating what proof is required to establish the correct date for this

reference, be it an affidavit from the author of the publication (Gregory O'Shea) or something else.


Additionally, Applicant would like to review the substance of the rejections. Particularly, Applicant believes that Applicant's previous arguments claiming that neither reference teaches or suggests deriving a network address from a public key are correct. Therefore, Applicant would like to discuss the Examiner's rationale for upholding the rejection in this regard.

Furthermore, Applicant would like to discuss the Section 112 rejections and whether or not the claims include elements that are not supported in the specification, as asserted in the Office Action. Applicant believes that explicit support for these terms that are well known in the art is not required.

One other note - our in-house group is starting a plan where we hope to have an attorney from our team in DC and at the USPTO for two weeks of every month - typically, the final two weeks of a month. We hope to do this until we can establish a small office in the area in the near future. I will be making several of these trips and would like to meet as many Examiners as I can while I am there. So I look forward to meeting with you next week.

Thank you for your time and consideration. If you wish to reach me to discuss this agenda, I may be reached at (425)705-3539 during regular business hours, PDT.

Best Regards,


James R. Banowsky
Microsoft Corporation
Reg. No. 37,773

5-11-2006
Date